

**APPLICANT ARGUMENTS OR REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-28 are now in the application. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16 and 17 are amended. Claim 28 is new. Claim 1, 9, 17 and 28 are independent claims.

**Claim Objections.**

The Office Action objects to claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 because lines 28, 27 and 28 allegedly have the phrase “thereby automatic creation”. Applicants respectfully submit that the actual phrase used is “thereby automating creation of an electronic document”, that is both grammatically correct and conveys applicants’ intended meaning of automating the process of creating an electronic document. Applicants, therefore, request that this objection be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 allowed.

Claim 27 is objected to for reciting “the method of claim 17”, when claim 17 is a computer program product. Claim 27 has been amended to recite “the computer program product of claim 17”. Applicants, therefore, request that this objection be withdrawn and claim 27 be allowed.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In particular claims 1, 9 and 17 are rejected to for containing the limitation “enhanced HTML pages, containing said source HTML files”. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is directed to paragraph 42 of the present application, which clearly describes both the claimed subject matter and how to achieve the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 are rejected to for containing the limitation “specifying characteristics of the visual appearance of the electronic document adjacent to said source HTML file”. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to recite “a visual appearance of the electronic document framing said source HTML files”. The concept of the electronic document framing said source HTML file” is clearly illustrated in the application in, for instance, figure 3.

By these amendments, applicants submit that claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicants, therefore, requests that these rejections be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 allowed.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

In particular, claims 1, 9 and 17 recite the limitation “said source HTML file” in line 19. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 17 to recite “said source HTML files”.

By these amendments, applicants submit that claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants, therefore, requests that these rejections be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 allowed.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeRose et al. (US Patent 6,167,409).

DeRose describes a method of converting an electronic document in one form of markup language to an electronic document in a second form of markup document, in particular converting from SGML to HTML, as detailed in, for instance, paragraph 7, lines 7-

9. Nothing in DeRose teaches or suggests the generation of HTML documents that can be viewed independent of external server-based technology.

Applicants invention, in contrast, specifically claims and enables this novel element, in each independent claim.

As claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 18 and 22-27 each depend from, and include all the limitations of, a now allowable independent claim, they too are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that these claims now be allowed.

### **Summary**

Therefore in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, favorable reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of all rejections and objections and that claims 1-2, 6-10, 14-18 and 22-28 be allowed at an early date and the patent allowed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Mark D. Simpson/  
Mark D. Simpson, Reg. No. 32,942

Synnestvedt Lechner and Woodbridge  
P. O. Box 592  
Princeton, NJ 08542-0592  
Tel. (609) 924-3773  
Fax (609) 924-1811